



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,474	07/11/2001	Norman Wesley Gimbert	13DV-14215	9339

7590

04/09/2003

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
One metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,474

Applicant(s)

GIMBERT ET AL.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. DOV POPOVICI

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5, & 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s): ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,479).

As to claim 1, Nelson discloses a method for communicating aircraft and aircraft engine (See column 1, lines 12-23) information using a system including a first server system and a second server system, the first server system including a first web server and a first database, the second server system including a second web server and a second database (See column 2, lines 28-60, wherein “second” reads on “network of customer devises”), said method comprising the steps of:

coupling the first web server to the first database (See column 2, lines 28-60, wherein “coupling” reads on “network”);

accessing at least one web page populated with data from the first database via a computer including a browser (See figure 4, 80, shows “web browser” represented by a screen shot titled” online finding report”); coupling the second web server to the second database;

accessing at least one web page populated with data from the second database via the computer browser; and

selectively accessing data stored in the first server system database via the second server system (See column 3, lines 19-51, wherein “web page” reads on “online catalog”, and wherein “selectively accessing” reads on “searchable”, also see column 3, lines 1-7, wherein “computer browser” reads on “standard web browser”).

As to claim 2, Nelson discloses wherein said step of coupling the first web server to the first database further comprises the step of providing a first server system (See column 2, lines 27-49) hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See column 1, lines 16-23).

As to claim 3, Nelson discloses wherein said step of coupling the second web server to the second database further comprises the step of providing a second server system hosted by an aircraft manufacturer (See column 4, lines 12-37, wherein “second database” reads on “intranet”, also see column 1, lines 16-29).

As to claim 4, Nelson discloses wherein said step of selectively accessing data stored in the first server system further comprises the step of selectively accessing data from the first and second server systems based on individual access privileges (See figure 9, 404, shows “access privileges” represented by “log-on”).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 6, and 13, Nelson discloses a web-based communications system comprising:

a computer comprising a browser; a network coupled to said computer (See column 2, lines 43-56);

a first server system comprising a first web server and a first database, said first web server coupled to said first database and to said network, said first web server configured to cause to be displayed at said computer at least one web page populated with data from said first database (See column 2, lines 43-56); and

a second server system comprising a second web server and a second database, said second web server coupled to said second database and to said network, said second web server configured to cause to be displayed at said computer at least one web page populated with data from said second database, data stored in said first server system database selectively accessible to said browser via said second server system (See column 2, lines 43-67, wherein “second” reads on “plurality of devices....servers for a network of customer devices”, and wherein “displayed” reads on “user interfaces”, also see column 3, lines 19-33, wherein “web page” reads on “Customer Web Center”).

As to claims 7, and 15, Nelson discloses wherein said data stored in said first server system and said second server system accessible to the user browser (See column 2, lines 43-59) based on based on individual access privileges (See column 3, lines 59-67, and column 4, lines 1-7).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 8, and 14, Nelson discloses wherein said first server system 9 (See column 2, lines 42-49) hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer (See column 1, lines 12-15), said second server system hosted by a business partner of the turbine engine manufacturer (See column 1, lines 52-58, wherein “business partner” reads on “customer”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 9-12, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,479) in view of Glass et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,965).

As to claim 5, Nelson discloses wherein said step of selectively accessing data stored in the first server system (See column 2, lines 43-49) further comprises the step of selectively accessing at least one of aircraft engine and aircraft data relating to at least one of general information data (See column 7, lines 64-67), propulsion systems data (See figure 3, shows “propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering data a (See figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”).

Nelson does not disclose plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. discloses plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Art Unit: 2175

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson by the teaching of Glass et al. to include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claims 9, and 10, Nelson discloses wherein at least one of said first database and said second database includes aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data (See column 7, lines 64-67), propulsion systems data (See figure 3, shows “propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering data (See figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”).

Nelson does not disclose plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. discloses plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson by the teaching of Glass et al. to include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 11, Nelson does not disclose wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes.

Glass et al. discloses wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes (See column 5, lines 34-51, wherein “maintains a record” reads on “flight history”, also see column 22, lines 38-63, wherein “navigational changes” reads on “flight plans”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson to include wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 12, Nelson discloses a database structure configured to be protected from access by unauthorized individuals (See column 3, lines 8-18, wherein “unauthorized individuals” reads on “user authentication”), said database structure comprising a first database and a second database, said first database coupled to a first server system hosted (See column 43-67, wherein “second” reads on “plurality of devices...servers”) by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See column 1, lines 16-30), said second database coupled to a second server system hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer, at least one of said first

Art Unit: 2175

database and said second database including information relating to at least one of general information (See column 7, lines 64-67, wherein “general information” reads on all filed listings presented), propulsion systems See figure 3, shows “propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering (See figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”), said first database linked to a first web page configured to be populated with data from said first database, said second database linked to a second web page configured to be populated from said second database (See column 1, lines 52-67, also see column 2, lines 43-49, wherein “web page” reads on web browser”).

Nelson does not disclose plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. discloses plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson by the teaching of Glass et al. to include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claims 16, and 18, Nelson discloses wherein said browser (See column 2, lines 44-49) configured to selectively display aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data (See column 7, lines 64-67), propulsion systems data (See figure 3, shows

Art Unit: 2175

“propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering data (See figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”).

Nelson does not disclose plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. discloses plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson by the teaching of Glass et al. to include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 17, Nelson does not disclose wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface.

Glass et al. discloses wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log (See column 5, lines 41-48) relating to navigational changes (See column 5, lines 34-51, wherein “maintains a record” reads on “flight history”, also see column 22, lines 38-63, wherein “navigational changes” reads on “flight plans”) to said user interface (See column 11, lines 12-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson to include wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface.

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Nelson by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tantry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,548,756) discloses object-oriented architecture for aircraft engine manufacturer.

Almstead et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,499,114) discloses remote diagnostic system for aircraft management.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-8114.


The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2175

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
April 7, 2003



DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100